DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 121 IR 051 536

AUTHOR Olevnik, Peter P.
TITLE A Study of the Organizational Implications of Faculty Status for Librarians in the College Library.
PUB DATE Mar 86
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; Correlation; Higher Education; *Librarians; Library Research; *Library Role; Library Surveys; *Organization; *Predictor Variables; Statistical Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Faculty Status

ABSTRACT

This paper reports the results of an investigation into the relationship between librarians' status (i.e., librarians having faculty status or librarians lacking such status) and the organizational structure of the college library. The analysis was conducted within the conceptual framework of two organizational models: the bureaucratic and the collegial. Data were obtained by means of a questionnaire mailed to library directors at 300 randomly selected college libraries throughout the United States. According to the data recieved from 235 institutions (78%), neither the lack of faculty status for librarians nor the possession of faculty status by librarians was found to have a strong association with the organizational model employed. (Author/THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OERI
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
[X] This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official position or policy.

ED270121

A STUDY OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF FACULTY STATUS FOR LIBRARIANS IN THE COLLEGE LIBRARY

by
Peter P. Olevnik

March 1986

IR051536

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Peter P. Olevnik
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

This paper reports the results of an investigation into the relationship between librarians' status (i.e., librarians having faculty status, or librarians lacking such status) and the organization of the college library. The analysis was conducted within the conceptual framework of two organizational models: the bureaucratic and the collegial. Data were obtained by means of a questionnaire sent to library directors at 300 randomly selected college libraries throughout the United States.

According to the data, neither the lack of faculty status for librarians nor the possession of faculty status by librarians was found to have a strong association with the organizational model employed.

INTRODUCTION

This paper describes a study of the relationship between librarians' status and the organizational structure of the college library. Librarians' status is classified according to two categories: (1) librarians having faculty status, and (2) librarians lacking such status. Analysis is conducted within the conceptual framework of two organizational models: the bureaucratic and the collegial.

Emphasis is on an analysis of the relationship between faculty status for librarians and the organizational structure of the library. In particular, the researcher seeks to determine the relationship between faculty status for librarians and a collegial model of library organization.

Do other variables just as effectively demonstrate a relationship with faculty status for librarians? To determine this, the researcher investigates the connection between librarians' status and (1) type of institutional control (i.e., public or independent), (2) physical arrangement of the library (i.e., established within a single facility, or decentralized with branches or departments located in separate facilities), and (3) size of the academic librarian staff.

From a population of approximately 1,000 institutions of

higher education (including the nation's public and independent four-year colleges), a simple random sample was selected to represent, as accurately as possible, the larger population. The institutions considered for the study were selected from a classified list provided by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1976)./1

From a population sample of 300 institutions, 235 responses to a mailed questionnaire were received, resulting in a return rate of 78 percent. Of the questionnaires returned, 30 were judged to be unusable. This resulted in a return rate of 68 percent for usable responses.

It is important to note that the data for analysis were obtained from questionnaires completed by library directors from the selected institutions. Thus, the study tests for perceptions of the library's chief executive officer.

DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis of association between librarians' status and the other selected variables previously mentioned takes the form of a series of crosstabulations. Two tests are used to provide information about the relationship between variables: the chi-square measure of independence, and the chi-square-based Cramer's V measure of association between variables.

The first step compares the number of observed responses with the expected number of cases that fall within a given

cell of the table. The actual data (i.e. observed number of cases labeled "count") appear within each cell of the various crosstabulations. The expected number of cases (enclosed within parentheses) appear alongside the observed cases.

A second step, employing the chi-square test of independence, compares the observed data set with the expected data set, proceeding on the assumption that a table's row and column variables are independent. The calculated chi-square is compared, then, to the critical points of the theoretical chi-square distribution to provide an estimate of how likely, or unlikely, this calculated value is if the two variables are in fact independent./2 The resulting probability value, also known as the observed significance level of the test, appears in the following tables after the "significance" label. With the SPSS analysis used in this study, the probability is rounded to four decimal places. For the study, if the probability is less than 0.05, the hypothesis that the two variables are independent is rejected.

The final step, providing analysis of the strength of the connection between the selected variables, employs the Cramer's V test of association. This test permits comparison of the chi-square values from tables with varying dimensions, and it restricts the range of values of the measure to those between 0 and 1. This measure will be 0 if the variables are unrelated; it will have a value of +1 if the variables are perfectly and positively related; and it will have a value of

-1 if the variables are perfectly and inversely related.

LIBRARIANS' STATUS AND LIBRARY ORGANIZATION

According to the respondents, librarians in nearly three-quarters of the libraries surveyed (73.2 percent) are granted faculty status. For purposes of analysis, the responses are grouped into two categories: (1) institutions in which librarians have faculty status, and (2) institutions in which librarians lack such status.

Data related to the organizational structure of the library were obtained from the directors' responses to fifteen statements provided on the questionnaire: eight of the statements refer to characteristics associated with collegial model, while seven relate to characteristics connected with the bureaucratic paradigm./3

Responses are arranged into the following organizational categories: (1) high bureaucratic/low collegial, (2) more bureaucratic than collegial, (3) a mixed model (i.e., having an approximately equal number of characteristics of both models), (4) more collegial than bureaucratic, and (5) high collegial/low bureaucratic. The categories are determined on the basis of average scores compiled according to each director's responses to the fifteen statements.

The average scores of the responses are based on a category scaling measurement technique. According to this technique, respondents select one of five category options

associated with each statement.

The directors are asked to indicate their viewpoints concerning each organizational characteristic as it applies to their library organizations. The scale of responses to each question ranges from "1": complete agreement with the statement, "2": agreement to a large extent, and "3": agreement to some extent, to "4": very little agreement, and "5 : no agreement at all. According to the data, the directors perceive their organizations to include characteristics of both the bureaucratic and the collegial models. None of the directors were found to view their libraries exclusively in terms of either model.

The calculated average scores of the director's responses to all statements relating to each of the two organizational models are then arranged into the five organizational categories described above. Average scores range from "1" indicating all characteristics of the model are completely applicable within the director's organization, to "5" indicating the characteristics are not applicable. Each director's average score is determined on the basis of a computer-assisted calculation./4

Table 1 provides a crosstabulation of the five organizational categories and the two status types. The number of cases for each combination of values of the two variables is displayed in each cell of the table, together with various row, column, and total percentages.

TABLE 1

CROSSTABULATION OF ORGANIZATIONAL MODEL SUB-SETS

BY CATEGORY OF LIBRARIANS' STATUS

Count Row Percent Column Percent Total Percent	High Bur/ Low Coll	More Bur Than Coll	Mixed Model	More Coll Than Bur	High Coll/ Low Bur	Row Total
No Faculty Status	3 (4.8) 5.5 16.7 1.5	4 (5.1) 7.3 21.0 2.0	28 (27.1) 51.0 27.7 13.7	9 (10.0) 16.4 24.3 4.4	11 (8.0) 20.0 36.7 5.4	55 26.8
Faculty Status	15 (13.2) 10.0 83.3 7.3	15 (14.0) 10.0 79.0 7.3	73 (74.0) 48.7 72.3 35.8	28 (27.0) 18.7 75.7 13.7	19 (22.0) 12.7 63.3 9.3	150 73.2
Column Total	18 8.8	19 9.3	101 49.3	37 18.0	30 14.6	205 100.0

Chi square = 2.94366 with 4 degrees of freedom

Significance = 0.57116

Cramer's V = 0.11983

From the table, it can be seen that there is little difference between observed and expected cases falling within each cell. It should be noted that the number of expected cases is computed on the assumption that the variables are unrelated, while the observed cases show the degree to which the assumption is violated.

Chi-square is equal to 2.94366, with 4 degrees of freedom. If organizational type and status type are independent, the probability that a random sample would result in a chi-square value of the magnitude shown is 0.57116. Thus, the independence hypothesis is not rejected, leading to acceptance of the hypothesis that librarians' status and organizational type are independents.

This analysis of probability is confirmed by the Cramer's V test of the strength of association. Recalling that a Cramer's V will be +1 if the variables are perfectly and positively related, the fact that Cramer's V is equal to 0.11983, in Table 1, indicates a weak level of association between the variables, well down the scale of possible values of V.

LIBRARIANS' STATUS AND TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL

After examining the connection between librarians' status and the organization of the library, this study considers the relationship between librarians' status and type of institutional control (i.e., public or independent).

This analysis is reported in Table 2.

TABLE 2

CROSSTABULATION OF TYPE OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL

BY CATEGORY OF LIBRARIANS' STATUS

Count Row Percent Column Percent Total Percent	Public Institutions	Independent Institutions	Row Total
No Faculty Status	14 (16.9) 25.5 22.2 6.8	41 (38.1) 74.5 28.9 20.0	55 26.8
Faculty Status	49 (46.0) 32.7 77.8 23.9	101 (104.0) 67.3 71.1 49.3	150 73.2
Column Total	63 30.7	142 69.3	205 100.0

Chi square = 1.00055 with 1 degree of freedom

Significance = 0.3237

Cramer's V = 0.06986

The table reveals very little difference between observed and expected cases. Chi square is equal to 1.00055, with 1 degree of freedom. If status type and institutional control type are independent, the probability that a random sample would result in a chi-square value of this magnitude is 0.3237. Thus, again, the independence hypothesis is not rejected, leading to acceptance of the hypothesis that librarians' status and type of institutional control are independent.

In this case, Cramer's V is equal to 0.06986. This test reveals a very weak connection between the variables, approaching the lower limit of the range of values of V.

LIBRARIANS' STATUS AND PHYSICAL ARRANGEMENT OF THE LIBRARY

A third examination considers the relationship between the library's physical arrangement and librarians' status. The physical arrangement of libraries is defined according to the following categories: (1) those libraries consolidated into a single facility; (2) those decentralized, with one branch or departmental library located in a separate facility; and (3) those decentralized, with more than one branch or departmental library.

Emphasis here is on a possible connection between librarians' status and the complexity of the library organization. Would a decentralized system, which includes separate branch or departmental libraries and an expanded

span of control, place such importance on the administrative functions of maintaining the organization, and, in particular, lines of communication within it, as to discourage the granting of faculty status to librarians? Or, would the evidence show a stronger connection between librarians having faculty status and libraries located in single facilities? To find out, the two categories of librarians' status are tallied separately for each of the three categories related to the physical arrangement of libraries.

Table 3 reveals little difference, generally, between expected and observed cases within the cells. There is one exception. While the number of cases reported is very small (only 1.5 percent of call cases reported), only about one-half of the expected number of respondents indicate that librarians employed in decentralized systems with one branch departmental facility do not have faculty status. In contrast, slightly more respondents than expected report that librarians employed in decentralized systems, with one branch or departmental facility, do have faculty status. Again, while the significance of the results are minimized by the small number of cases involved, the previous results are lessened further by reverse finding for decentralized systems with more than one branch or departmental library.

TABLE 3

CROSSTABULATION OF PHYSICAL ARRANGEMENT

BY CATEGORY OF LIBRARIANS' STATUS

Count Row Percent Column Percent Total Percent	Consolidated Into Single Facility	Decentralized With One Branch or Departmental Library	Decentralized With More Than One Branch or Departmental Library	Row Total
No Faculty Status	45 (43.5) 81.8 27.8 22.0	3 (6.4) 5.5 12.5 1.5	7 (5.1) 12.7 36.8 3.4	55 26.8
Faculty Status	117 (118.5) 78.0 72.2 57.1	21 (17.5) 14.0 87.5 10.2	12 (14.0) 8.0 63.2 5.9	150 73.2
Column Total	162 79.0	24 11.7	19 9.3	205 100

Chi square = 3.57051 with 2 degrees of freedom

Significance = 0.1746

Cramer's V = 0.13197

If the librarians' status and the physical arrangement of the library are independent, the probability that a random sample would result in a chi-square value of the magnitude reported in Table 3 is 0.1746. Thus, the independence hypothesis is accepted.

In Table 3, Cramer's V is equal to 0.13197. This indicates a very modest level of association between the variables.

LIBRARIANS' STATUS AND THE NUMBER OF EMPLOYED LIBRARIANS

The fourth, and final, relationship to be investigated is that between librarians' status and the size of the library's professional staff. Staff size is classified according to the following: (1) fewer than five librarians, (2) from five to fifteen librarians, and (3) more than fifteen librarians.

An examination of the various cells of the crosstabulation of the two variables in Table 4 reveals very little if any difference between expected and observed cases. Chi-square is equal to 0.47799, with 2 degrees of freedom. If librarians' status and professional staff size are independent, the probability that a random sample would result in a chi-square value of the magnitude found is 0.7880. Thus, the independence hypothesis is not rejected.

TABLE 4

CROSSTABULATION OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF SIZE

BY CATEGORY OF LIBRARIANS' STATUS

Count Row Percent Column Percent Total Percent	Below Five Librarians	From Five to Fifteen Librarians	Over Fifteen Librarians	Row Total
No faculty Status	26 (28.2) 47.3 24.8 12.7	23 (21.2) 41.8 29.1 11.2	6 (5.6) 10.9 28.6 3.0	55 26.8
Faculty Status	79 (76.8) 52.7 75.2 38.5	56 (57.8) 37.3 70.9 27.3	15 (15.3) 10.0 71.4 7.3	150 73.2
Column Total	105 51.2	79 38.5	21 10.2	205 100.0

Chi square = 0.47799 with 2 degrees of freedom

Significance = 0.7880

Cramer's V = 0.04829

The analysis of probability is confirmed by the Cramer's V test of association between variables. In Table 4, Cramer's V is equal to 0.04829. This test reveals a very weak level of association between librarians' status and professional staff size, near the bottom of the range of possible values of V.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The test of statistical significance was computed to estimate the significance of association between four sets of variables. The acceptable level of significance in the study was 0.05. This means that the chances of obtaining the measured association as a result of sampling error were 5/100, or 5 out of 100. From Figure 1, it is seen that the level of significance for each table exceeds the level established for this study, affirming the null hypothesis, i.e., independence of the variables.

The chi-square test of independence provides little information about the strength of association between variables. This information is obtained by means of the Cramer's V measure of association. This measure will be 0 if the variables are unrelated; it will have a value of +1 if the variables are perfectly and positively related; and it will have a value of -1 if the variables are perfectly and inversely related. Figure 1 records the results of the

Cramer's V test for the four paired variables examined in this study.

FIGURE 1

SUMMARY OF LEVELS OF ASSOCIATION BETWEEN LIBRARIANS' STATUS AND FIVE VARIABLES

		Observed Level of Significance	Cramer's V Measure of Association
Table 1:	Organizational Model by Librarians' Status	0.57116	0.11983
Table 2:	Institutional Control by Librarians' Status	0.3237	0.06986
Table 3:	Physical Arrangement by Librarians' Status	0.1746	0.13197
Table 4:	Professional Staff Size by Librarians' Status	0.7880	0.04829

The Cramer's V test revealed a positive association between the variables.. The level of association, however, was in the lower range of values, indicating very little connection between the paired variables.

Emphasis was on an analysis of the relationship between faculty status for librarians and the organizational structure of the four-year college library. In particular, the researcher sought to determine the level of association between the collegial model of library organization and faculty status for librarians.

While little connection was found between these two variables, and the small number of reported cases in some of the table's cells minimized the significance of the results where differences were found, Table 1 revealed a reverse pattern from that expected, assuming that faculty status for librarians includes a collegial form of library organization. There were more observed cases than expected cases for librarians with faculty status to be employed in libraries described as "high bureaucratic/low collegial." There were fewer observed cases than expected cases, however, for librarians lacking faculty status to be employed in such organizations. In contrast, there were fewer cases than expected cases for librarians with faculty status to be employed in libraries described as "high collegial/low bureaucratic." There were more cases than expected cases, however, for librarians lacking such status to be employed

in such institutions.

In addition, while all paired variables were found to have weak levels of association between them, Figure 1 reveals that one other pair (physical arrangement by librarians' status - Table 3) exceeded in level of association that found for librarians' status and library organization.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study did not investigate whether, or to what extent, librarians meet the general criteria for faculty status. Rather, it began by accepting responses from randomly selected library directors to a question on a questionnaire asking whether or not librarians at the respondent's library had faculty status.

On the basis of the directors' responses, this study did attempt to determine the extent of the connection between librarians' status (i.e., librarians having faculty status, or librarians lacking such status) and library organization. Two models of organization were considered: the bureaucratic and the collegial. Characteristics of the models were based on characteristics identified by Peter M. Blau (1962), in reference to the bureaucratic model,/5 and characteristics defined by G. Lester Anderson (1963) in relation to the collegial paradigm. /6

The assumption was made that librarians having faculty

status would be employed in college libraries implementing a collegial model of organization. This assumption was made on the basis of the criterion adopted by the Association of College and Research Libraries in that group's 1971 "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians./7

The study did establish that a positive association was found between librarians' status and forms of library organization. That association was found to be well down the scale of possible values used to measure the association between variables, however.

According to the data, neither the lack of faculty status for librarians nor the possession of faculty status was found to have a strong association with the organizational model employed. More specifically, this study found very little, if any, significant relationship between the granting of faculty status to librarians and library organizations tending more toward the collegial model.

NOTES

1/ Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, Classification of Institutions of Higher Education: A Report of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. rev. ed. (Berkeley, California: The Council, 1976).

2/ Marija J. Norusis, SPSSX: Introductory Statistics Guide. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1983), p. 53.

3/ Peter P. Olevnik, "A Study of the Organizational Implications of Faculty Status for Librarians in the College Library," diss. State University of New York at Buffalo 1985, pp. 101-02.

4/ Average scores were calculated according to the following:

A. High bureaucratic-low collegial:

An average collegial score minus the average bureaucratic score was less than or equal to 0.900, but greater than or equal to 0.500.

B. More bureaucratic than collegial:

An average collegial score minus the average bureaucratic score was less than or equal to 0.900, but greater than or equal to 0.500.

C. Mixed model:

An average bureaucratic score minus the average collegial score was less than 0.500, and the average collegial score minus the average bureaucratic score was less than 0.500.

D. More collegial than bureaucratic:

An average bureaucratic score minus the average collegial score was less than or equal to 0.900, but greater than or equal to 5.00.

E. High collegial-low bureaucratic:

An average collegial score was less than or equal to 2.900, and the average bureaucratic score minus the average collegial score was greater than 0.900.

5/ Peter M. Blau and Richard W. Scott, Formal Organizations. (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962), 32-33.

6/ G. Lester Anderson, "Organizational Character of American Colleges and Universities." Study of Academic Administration, ed. Terry F. Lunsford. (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963), 11-12.

7/ "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians," College and Research Libraries News, 33 (1972), 211.